7 T.C. 1002 (1946)

In a proceeding to redetermine excessive profits under the Renegotiation Act, the petitioner bears the burden of proving the original determination was incorrect, while the respondent bears the burden regarding any new matter or increased amount of excessive profits alleged in their answer.

Summary

Nathan Cohen, a partnership, contested the Under Secretary of War's determination that $32,000 of its 1942 profits were excessive due to renegotiation of war contracts. The Secretary of War, in an amended answer, claimed excessive profits were at least $43,000. The Tax Court held that Cohen failed to prove the original determination was wrong and the Secretary failed to prove additional excessive profits. The court emphasized the importance of burden of proof in cases with equally strong evidence on both sides, following Tax Court rules to guide the decision where evidence was incomplete.

Facts

Nathan Cohen and his three sons operated a woodworking partnership. Their business significantly increased in 1942 due to war contracts. The Under Secretary of War determined $32,000 of their 1942 profits were excessive under the Renegotiation Act. Cohen contested this, arguing their profits were fair and reasonable. The Secretary of War amended the answer, claiming excessive profits were at least $43,000.

Procedural History

The Under Secretary of War initially determined excessive profits. Cohen petitioned the Tax Court for redetermination. The Secretary of War filed an amended answer seeking a higher amount of excessive profits. The Tax Court heard the case to determine the correct amount of excessive profits.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the petitioner, Nathan Cohen, proved that the Under Secretary of War's initial determination of $32,000 in excessive profits was incorrect.

2. Whether the respondent, the Secretary of War, proved that the petitioner's excessive profits were greater than the initially determined $32,000.

Holding

1. No, because the petitioner failed to provide sufficient evidence to overcome the initial determination.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

2. No, because the respondent failed to provide sufficient evidence to support the claim for additional excessive profits.

Court's Reasoning

The Tax Court relied heavily on the burden of proof. It noted that while renegotiation proceedings are *de novo*, procedural rules still apply. The court cited Rule 32 of the Tax Court Rules of Practice, stating, "The burden of proof shall be upon the petitioner, except as otherwise provided by statute, and except that in respect of any new matter pleaded in his answer, it shall be upon the respondent." The court found the evidence regarding the amount of renegotiable business and the reasonableness of partners' salaries to be incomplete and indecisive. Since neither party presented convincing evidence to shift the balance, the court held that the petitioner failed to prove the initial determination incorrect, and the respondent failed to prove additional excessive profits.

The court stated, "On the two subordinate issues of fact in the present proceeding the evidence is incomplete and indecisive… For practical purposes, it can be said that the record on both of the factual issues is as strong — or as weak — in favor of one party to the controversy as of the other. On neither has the evidence of either party succeeded in persuading us that the figure should be different from that conceded by the other."

Practical Implications

This case clarifies the application of burden of proof in Tax Court proceedings for redetermining excessive profits under the Renegotiation Act. It highlights that even in *de novo* reviews, the petitioner challenging the initial determination has the burden of proving it wrong. The respondent bears the burden for any new matters raised in their answer. It informs legal practice by requiring petitioners to present strong evidence to challenge initial determinations, especially where factual issues are contested. This decision is relevant to administrative law and tax litigation, showing how procedural rules like burden of proof can be decisive when evidence is balanced.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.